

App'l. No. 10/799,370  
Am'dt. dated June 22, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Atty. Ref. 81754.0113  
Customer No. 26021

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-20 were presented. Claims 10 and 14, which are withdrawn from consideration as a result of the previous restriction requirement and election, are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15 and 17-19 are amended. Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 are now pending.

**Claim Objections**

As requested, in claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15 and 17-19, all instances of "second identification information have been replaced with --data communication system information--, and all instances of "first identification information" have been replaced with --tag identification information--.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112**

Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-20 are definite and in compliance with 35 USC 112.

First, the Action points out that the data communication system of each claim recites "identification information acquisition means" for acquiring tag identification information, as well as "position information computation means" that uses tag identification information acquired from other data communication systems to compute position information. The Action questions why the data communication system would acquire tag information but not use it (i.e., the tag information of the other systems, not the system itself, is used to compute position information).

In response, applicant notes that each data communication system of the plurality of data communication systems (i.e. 3A-3F) must be capable of playing two roles. For example, a data communication system 3A may sometimes be called on to act as the representative system, that is, the system that gathers information

Appl. No. 10/799,370  
Amdt. dated June 22, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Atty. Ref. 81754.0113  
Customer No. 26021

from the other systems and computes position information. In this role, it uses the tag information acquired from other systems to compute position, but does not itself acquire tag information for purposes of computing position. At other times, when system 3A is not the representative system, it acquires tag information and provides that information to another system which computes the position information.

Thus, although a data communication system of the present invention will not simultaneously be collecting tag information from other systems as well as collecting tag information itself, it must have means to do both since it will be required to do one or the other, depending on whether or not it is the representative system. The recitations of applicant's claims properly and accurately reflect this situation, i.e. "means to acquire the tag information from the contactless identification tag..." and "means to acquire...the tag information acquired in the other data communication systems...".

Applicant submits that the remaining concerns expressed in the Action flow from this fundamental misunderstanding and that, once the claims are correctly interpreted as set forth above, there are no remaining clarity or vagueness issues. For example, there will not be a situation, about which the Action expressed concern, where the representative system detects the tag in its range but the other systems do not, since the representative system, as discussed above, does not detect the tag. As described in the specification, if the tag is not detected by any of the other systems, the operator may access move records. This feature is the subject of some of the dependent claims, for example, claims 6-9.

For these reasons, applicant submits that the claims are clear and definite, and that the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

There being no further grounds for rejection, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the


App'l. No. 10/799,370  
Amdt. dated June 22, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Atty. Ref. 81754.0113  
Customer No. 26021

undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fee due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 22, 2006

By:   
Troy M. Schmelzer  
Registration No. 36,667  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701